

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/040,485

Applicant(s)  
Radosevich et al

Examiner  
Julie E. Burke (Reeves), Ph.D.

Group Art Unit  
1642



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Julie E. Burke (Reeves), Ph.D.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Alice Martin

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview 14 Jun 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 6, 7, 9-11, 19, and 20

Identification of prior art discussed:

none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner provided advice on which set of claims needed amending as claims submitted after final have not been entered into the case, claims submitted 9/10/99 is the last entered amdt. Examiner pointed out how the fragments of claim 9 read upon peptides which have one amino acid in common with those fragments; that absent a structural limitation (length of fragment, removed by last after final amdt) or absent a functional limitation, the claim would stand rejected under 35 USC 112. Examiner explained that the last amdt (ne) the functional limitation was moved to outside the open language "comprising". Applicants intend to file another amdt.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

*Julie Burke*  
**JULIE BURKE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/040,485

Applicant(s)  
Radosevich et al

Examiner  
Julie E. Burke (Reeves), Ph.D.

Group Art Unit  
1642



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Julie E. Burke (Reeves), Ph.D.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Alice Martin

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview 14 Jul 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-21

Identification of prior art discussed:

4 items filed on IDS Paper no 17

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner will enter after final filed 615/00. Examiner obtained permission to cancel nonelected claims 1-5, 8, 12-18. Examiner obtained permission to cancel claim 7 and to amend claim 9. The Supplemental IDS was filed without payment of fees, certification or petition, as required for IDS filed afterfinal, therefore the IDS was not proper and the PTO 1449 form will not be signed. The references on the IDS filed 3/20/00 had already been considered by the Examiner and a PTO 892 is attached to this paper which lists them.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☒ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

*J Burke*

**JULIE BURKE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
Paper No. 23